

February 20, 1975

legislation. If some of these areas that concern has been talked about we could tighten this up if the voters so decided to let us . . . enabled us to do this. We could tighten it up in the bill when we implemented it in the future.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Senator Nichol.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of Senator Cavanaugh if I may.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Do you yield Senator Cavanaugh?

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: I do.

SENATOR NICHOL: Having been a county commissioner and having been kicked around a little bit by the people who come in to complain about their taxes going up and very often this is true because they have improved their property. Maybe I don't understand the purpose of the bill, but as I do understand it, is it correct that when people do improve their property they will not be penalized by having their real estate taxes raised? Is that correct?

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: That's correct, Senator Nichol.

SENATOR NICHOL: OK, now the next question is, is this going to apply to all one-family dwellings? For example, you may have a house that's worth \$40,000 but you let it go unpainted and do not fix it up for the purpose of allowing your taxes to be reduced. Someone else next door to you maintains their house in a good manner and their taxes stay up high. Now how are you going to instruct county assessors and county boards to handle that so that they will be fair to all? The next question is, are you going to have this just to people of poverty stature?

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: There's no income requirement in the bill. That was another question Senator Dworak had raised, as to whether . . . it also applies to absentee landlords. The definition is blighted or deteriorated. Or the criteria in the constitutional amendment is blighted or deteriorated. Those terms have not been defined and they would be left for a future Legislature to define. The question you raise is somewhat similar to Senator Murphy's, are people going to allow their homes to deteriorate to the point of blight in order to receive the tax benefit. I really can't contemplate the incentive there. In implementation what this would allow is say you've got a \$15,000 house. The front porch has fallen off of it. You replace the front porch. As a result of that the county assessor comes out and says, OK now you have a \$17,000 house and you will be taxed at such a rate on the \$17,000. The effect of this bill would be, the difference between the house with the falling off front porch and with an improved front porch is \$2,000 is what the assessor says the value is. OK, you're still going to be taxed, under this bill, for the \$15,000 house. You will not be taxed, for five years, on the \$2,000 improvement. For you to let your entire house deteriorate around you to get that kind of a tax break just doesn't seem to make much sense. You wouldn't come out ahead, as far as the property value of your home. I don't think there's going to be that much encouragement to indulge in that kind of activity.